

### REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 10/03/2007 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). Applicants note with appreciation that claims 18, 19, 29 and 30 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-17 and 20-28 were rejected.

By virtue of this amendment, the specification and claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 14 and 15 are sought to be amended, claim 4 is sought to be canceled, and new claim 31 is sought to be added. The amendments, cancellation and additions are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments, addition and cancellation are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-3 and 5-31 are thus respectfully presented for reconsideration.

### *Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)*

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering and making of record the two IDS filed on 8/20/2004 and 4/14/2005 respectively. The Examiner is also thanked for acknowledging the same in the Outstanding Office Action.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103*

Claims 1-4 and 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP Number US 6211727 issued to Carobolante (hereafter "Carobolante").

Without acquiescing to any of the assertions in the Outstanding Office Action, it is Applicants position that the claims, at least as amended, are allowable over the art of record.

For example, currently amended claim 1 recites, among other features, "... wherein each of said plurality of portions is at a corresponding one of a plurality of non-contiguous areas of said integrated circuit".

Due to such a feature, the supply voltage can be adjusted taking into consideration the status in different non-contiguous areas of the integrated circuit.

Such a feature is neither disclosed nor reasonably suggested by Carobolante, at least for reasons noted below.

5 In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner appears to rely on the measurement performed using multiple transistors 22 (arguably in different portions) shown in Figure 2 of Carobolante. All of these transistors are within the same contiguous area formed by the dotted lines associated with sensing circuit 14 shown there.

Accordingly, it is asserted that currently amended claim 1 is allowable over Carobolante.

10 Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Currently amended claim 5 is independently allowable in reciting, "... receiving said measured values on a multiplexer which provides each value on a path, and processing each of said measured values using a shared circuit coupled to receive each value on said path."

15 The Examiner concedes that Carobolante does not disclose the claimed multiplexer and instead relies on USP Number 7088172 issued to Lesea *et al* (hereafter "Lesea"). It is respectfully noted that the multiplexer of Figure 7 of Lesea is directed to a voltage divider circuit, which receives different voltage levels generated from a resistor ladder.

There is no disclosure or suggestion to use the multiplexer of Lesea in the manner claimed in currently amended claim 5.

20 Currently amended independent claim 12 is allowable over Carobolante in reciting that, "... wherein each of said plurality of measured values represents said characteristic of a corresponding different one of said plurality of portions."

In sharp contrast, any multiple values used for adjusting the supply voltage in Carobolante correspond to the same portion but received at different time instances.

Accordingly, currently amended claim 12 is allowable over Carobolante. Claims 13-30 depend from claim 12 and are allowable at least for reasons noted above with respect to claim 12.

Claim 26 is independently allowable in reciting, "... a random access memory (RAM) storing a lookup table containing measured values corresponding to a weak process corner, a nominal process corner and a strong process corner for a plurality of pre-determined levels of said supply voltage and said RAM provides said first value, said second value and said third value."

The Examiner is clearly engaging in impermissible hindsight gleaned only from the Applicant's disclosure in asserting that "... It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a RAM as the served device of Figure 2 of Leasa for the purpose of controlling the voltage of applications to reduce power used by the RAM applications."

As a threshold matter, none of the references of record is shown using a RAM for a purpose such as that claimed in claim 26. Accordingly, the combination of Carobolante and Lesea does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

### ***Conclusion***

Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome. Continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the attorney of record Mr. Steven Shaw at 972-917-5137 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416

Date: December 20, 2007